

On March 17th Albertans got their first chance to vote since the N.D.P and the Liberals forced ~~a new~~ ^{then first concealed during election} constitution ^{on} ~~the~~ ^{uninformed} unsuspecting people ~~who~~ had never been given a choice to vote on their own constitution because of its concealment during the last federal election.

~~On that date~~ ^{March 17th} ~~despite~~ The Albertans ~~by~~ ^{for} an overwhelming majority ~~to all other politicians~~ elected their first candidate, ~~the~~ ^{of} a new all western party named

Western concept. An election that took by surprise liberal conservatives & nearly the entire media. Trudeau immediately labeled the

Western voters racists and bigots.

We all ^{now} sadly ^{now} ~~now~~ ^{aware} know that Trudeau We now ^{all} sadly know ~~all~~ ^{only} we can expect

from ^{arrogance + name calling} ~~and~~ ^{from}
 that Trudeau is ^{disgusting} ~~better~~ at name calling
^{financially} ~~no~~ ^{at all} concern ^{for} our financial plight
 than being the financial guardian of our
 sagging financial funds, so that ^{want} ~~caused~~ ^{new} little
^{from} ~~so~~ ^{that name calling} ~~wasn't~~ ^{want} with even defending
~~concern~~. But on March 24th in the "Globe &
 Mail" Trudeau's office gave out a statement
 that the Western Concept's party platform,
 on which I advised was ~~entire~~, to
 be called a liar is something else, &
 demands an answer. The part of the Western
^{party} platform they disputed was their ^{support} ~~support~~ ^{which had gained} ~~them~~ ^{support}
 Western party would concern over the
 loss of ~~prop~~ individuals property
 rights by the

Trudeau's office & ~~Peter Seagheeds~~ ^{Ontarians}
 had to reassure ^{Ontarians} ~~new~~ frightened ~~Ontarians~~
 in the press assured the now frightened
 that like Quebec the West might remain
 Canadians but ^{just} leave Ontario with Mr

3

Davis, ^{to be governed by} and Mr Trudeau's constitution
+ to pay his debts. To calm their fears
Trudeau ^{officially} told them ^{now} ^{he assured them} mouthed a half truth
Canadians and the ~~visibly~~ angry Western

Canadians that section 26 of the constitution
~~gave them~~ ^{gave all} section 26 gave all.

~~gave the individuals adequate protection~~

of their prized ~~right to~~ property rights.
they needed (go to 3A)

~~Section 26 was a last minute addition~~

~~placed in the constitution~~ ^{just} before the

~~used & weary premiers who Trudeau had~~

~~labeled the "gang of eight" signed away the~~

~~their rights to~~ constitution. Levesque

~~reduced that "gang" to 7 and wisely~~

~~abstained from signing.~~

Section 26 does not protect individuals
property rights at all. It only recognizes
it there existence if you remove the

double negatives. It guarantees the other
rights in the charter but not the

ones omitted which includes property rights. It says nothing about property or "other" rights being enforceable read it

26 The guarantee in this charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed as denying the EXISTENCE of any other right or freedom.

nothing says your past rights will be enforceable just they exist.

The enforcement of your rights is removed in the later section 51⁽¹⁾ in the same statute & therefore governs or limits any proceeding statute. It says

51 (1) The Constitution of Canada is the SUPREME law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution is, to the

extent of that inconsistency of NO FORCE
OR EFFECT "

Property rights despite the effort of
the federal conservatives were deliberately
omitted from the constitution so
they are inconsistent & not enforceable

This limitation of the previous right
follows ~~the property~~ where past
property existence is recognized &
& limits them to not being enforceable
& It ^{further} specifically states that is the
supreme law of Canada (above any
other past laws)

A legal right without a legal
means of enforcing it against others
is valueless.

No longer can you say your paid for home is your castle. For that matter neither can you say your farm, your oil rig your factory or company or even the coat on your back is legally yours against all other persons because all these are property.

The governments have provided themselves with an underground tunnel that goes ^{right} under the old walls of your legal rights and lets them into your castle legally. One it is legal for them to use to occupy your castle. Furthermore they have legalized their occupancy by the constitutions section 54.35(1) of ~~the~~ That section commits (therefore allows actions) of either the provincial

by section (1), also - "promoting equal opportunities for the well being of Canadians". There are no limits on how that is to be promoted in the future and therefore they could include "the use of your property" by the government even to ^{just replenishing} ~~replenish~~ ~~their empty~~ the governments own ^{empty} coffers. There are no limits on the extent of these "opportunities" or ~~to~~ justification. How can you defend such a takeover? - Opportunities are mere future guesses not factually provable needs. So any future legislation they pass under section ~~31~~ 35(1) will be legally enforceable

because that is a right given them under the constitution and therefore according to section ~~one~~ 61 it is the ~~supreme law of Canada~~ + is enforceable ^{because it is not} inconsistent and therefore is enforceable + of effect. So the legal occupancy of your castle is provided

The statement issued by Fongbeed + Fudears office that our property rights are unchanged is the false one + ~~is~~ To surrender our right to enforce property rights is a great change in our democratic right. The western concept partly are

right to fear the demeritization of
your property rights. Read the constitution
for yourself - note the actual words

24 - only gives ^{no denial} ~~recognition~~ of existence ^{to your rights}
27 but 51 says your ~~self~~ ^{individual} property
rights are of no force or effect
and 35(a) gives the govt unlimited power
36(1) to promote opportunities which
can include occupation or use
of ^{individually} ~~your~~ property, ^{wherever} wherever
they choose by simply passing an
~~order~~.

All that is needed in the future will
be a govt department's order ^{to} of take over ^{in council}
As a matter of fact the order in
Council passed in June 10th this year
already enables ~~ready~~ gives such
authority to heads of each of the Fedl
government departments & it is
already to go as soon as the
constitution becomes law.